

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing and reconsideration of the subject application in light of the following comments are respectfully requested.

At the outset, applicants would like to thank Examiner Haley for the courteous and helpful interview extended to applicants' undersigned representative on October 6, 1994. Agreement as to allowance of claim 29 was reached during the interview. In particular, the word "halogen" was deleted from substituent X as helpfully suggested by the Examiner. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns regarding the subject application after review of the present Reply, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to contact their undersigned representative.

Applicants would also like to thank the Examiner for the indication that compound claims 31 and 32 have been allowed. Claim 30 depends on claim 29 and as such should also be in condition for allowance. Claims 33-36 were cancelled to expedite prosecution on the merits.

Applicants have attached hereto a copy of the parent applications for the subject application, in particular, U.S. Patent Nos. 4,963,590; 5,112,861; and 5,283,352. Because of various restriction requirements as well as election requirements in the parent applications, a number of patent applications were necessitated.

Applicants would now like to more particularly address the outstanding rejections. There is only one art rejection of record. Claims 29-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lauerer et al, U.S. Patent No. 3,278,448. As discussed extensively during the interview, Lauerer et al does not require the presence of

Serial No. 08/121,617

two hydroxy-type groups in the meta and para positions. Further, Lauerer et al suggests that a halogen atom near the 4-hydroxy position is essential. Lauerer et al discloses a different utility from the presently claimed compounds so there is no motivation to make applicants' specifically claimed compounds. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lauerer et al is respectfully traversed.

Claims 35 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, fourth paragraph, as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. In order to expedite prosecution on the merits as indicated above, claims 35 and 36 have been canceled and this rejection is made moot.

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance directed to claims 29-32 is believed to be next in order, and such action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding the subject application, she is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS

By: 

Teresa Stanek Rea
Registration No. 30,427

Post Office Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: November 23, 1994